

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO		
10/621,035	07/15/2003	William Paul Mazotti	NSC1P271/P05589	NSC1P271/P05589 1188		
22434 7.	590 01/23/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER		
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP			SONG, SA	SONG, SARAH U		
P.O. BOX 70250 OAKLAND, CA 94612-0250			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			2874			
			DATE MAILED: 01/23/2006	DATE MAILED: 01/23/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/621,035	MAZOTTI ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Sarah Song	2874	

Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sarah Song	2874	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 10 January 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods: The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of this A 	wing replies: (1) an amendment, affortice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in one with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must of the final rejection.	idavit, or other eviden compliance with 37 Cl ust be filed within one	rce, which FR 41.31; or (3) of the following
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply original three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropri inally set in the final Offi	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	
AMENDMENTS			
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) 	nsideration and/or search (see NO w);	TE below);	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in befappeal; and/or			the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	, ,	ected claims.	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1	` '/'		(DTOL OOA)
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1.		mpliant Amendment	(P10L-324).
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s). 		timely filed amendme	ent canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is profit The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-21 and 25-31. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		ll be entered and an e	explanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appear y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fai ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	ls to provide a 1).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•	
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	it does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowar	nce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	lo(s). <u>1105,1205</u>	/
13. Other:		Sarah Song Primary Examiner	

Primary Examiner Group Art Unit 2874 Smal Song

Continuation of 3. NOTE: amendment to claim 25 reciting "for electrically connecting the opto-electronic module with an external electrical device" requires further consideration.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Giboney et al. discloses the support block 29 wherein a semiconductor chip package (e.g. electrical component 36/92 (see col 19, lines 52-62) is mounted on the first face of the support block, and an optical device package 32 is mounted on the second face of the support block. Additionally, the inherent function of a printed circuit board is to operate as an electrical port for connection to other electrical devices, and therefore the PCB comprises a port end. Furthermore, the motivation as set forth in the previous Office Action to provide the flexible connection shown by Rosenberg et al. in the device of Giboney et al. would have been within the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Regarding claims 29 and 31, Rosenberg shows the directionally of the boards in Figure 4E showing the optical port facing to the left of the figure and an opposite end (i.e. port end) of the PCB facing to the right of the figure. It is additionally noted that the changeable board height is an inherent result of any flexible connector; however, it is also noted that the changeable board height is not required by the claim language.

Continuation of 12. The IDS filed 11/16/05 was filed after Final rejection and lacks the appropriate certification for consideration. Therefore, the IDS filed 11/16/05 has not been considered. The IDS filed 12/19/05 has been considered and placed of record in the file.